



APPENDIX H: PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT PROCESS

PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT PROCESS

Appendix H summarizes efforts undertaken by the MPO to gather public comment on Mobilizing Tomorrow as well as the feedback that was received. The MPO solicited comments a three intervals of the planning process.

Public Comment Intervals

Focus Groups

The Des Moines Area MPO is committed to a public engagement process that includes organizations and individuals whose work and lives are regularly affected by transportation decisions. From public arts to food pantries, city officials to immigrant advocates, education to emergency services, and beyond, the MPO works to incorporate all aspects of livelihoods and communities into the planning process. Discussions, comments, input, and more are sought through a number of different avenues.

National Household Travel Survey

The Des Moines Area MPO participated as an add-on participant for the 2017 National Household Travel Survey. Being an add-on participant allowed the Des Moines Area to receive an increased sample size (1,225) and the ability to add MPO specific questions to the survey for the Des Moines region

Capacity Project Submittal

The MPO sought feedback on projects that had been submitted by member governments for consideration in the plan. To gather this feedback, MPO staff hosted an interactive map on its website that illustrated all capacity projects submitted for consideration along with basic information about each project. Participants could review the projects and then submit comments via an online form.

Draft Plan Document

MPO sought feedback on the draft document. Feedback was collected online and at an open house.

Focus Groups

Before starting the process of developing a trajectory or language for this plan, MPO staff invited numerous agencies to participate in focus groups in January and February of 2018. Participating organizations included:

- Iowa Department of Human Rights
- Food Bank of Iowa
- Drake University
- Greater Des Moines Convention and Visitors Bureau
- YMCA of Greater Des Moines
- City of Des Moines
- Des Moines Area Regional Transit Authority
- Bravo Greater Des Moines
- LT Leon Associates, Inc.
- Polk County Conservation
- Polk County
- Des Moines Community School District
- City of Clive / City of Clive Fire Department
- Wellmark / Blue Cross Blue Shield
- Iowa Public Health Association
- Iowa Natural Heritage Foundation
- American Planning Association – Iowa Chapter
- Greater Des Moines Public Arts Foundation
- City of Norwalk
- Snyder & Associates
- Substance Architecture
- Christensen Development
- Transload Services
- Goodwill Industries
- Urban Land Institute
- Polk County Health Department
- City of Urbandale
- Des Moines Bicycle Collective

- United Way of Central Iowa
- Harkin Institute
- A Mid-Iowa Organizing Strategy
- HR Green
- HDR, Inc.
- Bridgestone
- Des Moines Area Community College

Individuals from these organizations were broken into small groups for a discussion facilitated by MPO staff. Discussion questions included:

1. Share a place where you've lived or travelled that has been your favorite place for getting around. What did you experience? Why did you like it so well?
2. Tell us about a time when a transportation system let you down.
3. Are there current trends in your field or experience that could affect transportation?
4. Are there emerging topics or initiatives that correlate with our Long-Range Transportation Plan goals? If so, what and how?
5. Knowing that this plan is being developed, write three things you hope the MPO planners will keep in mind throughout the planning process? Which of these surprise or interest you?

Through these discussions a number of trends emerged, and the MPO integrated some of them into the spotlight issues shown in Chapter 2. These include transportation's role in hunger, access to jobs, age-friendly cities, and stormwater management. Comments regarding themes and other topics that were common throughout the conversations are outlined below.

Equity & Mobility

- Cars are not the only mode of transportation. The touted 20-minute commute often only is applicable to using a car. Using transit or other alternative transportation modes can take considerably longer, yet we don't explore how to fix that.
- The Des Moines metro is becoming more diverse all the time. Agencies need to provide materials for limited-English speaking groups.
- Keep focus on outcomes: who wins and who loses when decisions are made?
- Accessibility for the persons with disabilities, carless, persons over 65, etc. should be taken into account in transportation decisions. Walking audits and other studies can help provide insight prior to implementing any actions.
- First mile, last mile (the beginning or end of an individual trip made primarily by public transportation) are one of the hardest hurdles to behavioral changes in transportation. In our current trajectory we are exacerbating this problem.
- Connectivity is very important, especially for those on the urban/rural fringe using public transportation.

Smart City

- Technology advancements continue to outpace affordability.
- Continue to prepare for autonomous vehicles, even if we do not know when they will become mainstream.
- Smart cities are not islands; they all work together. It is key to put regional partnerships in place to ensure the whole metro transportation system is working together.

Fiscal Responsibility

- We do not need more roads: we need to optimize and maintain what we have already.
- Focus and prioritize funding opportunities on integrating and promoting alternative modes of travel and technology over street widening and recreational trails.

Design Change

- Road diets may lead the way to encourage people to slow down and get out of their cars.
- Always incorporate new trends in street and parking designs.
- Density should be a priority; transportation infrastructure can greatly affect this.
- Green and complete streets should be a priority when improving infrastructure; if they are not, we are only continuing a negative feedback loop. Continue to promote both.

Social Change

- Sell a big picture vision, and communicate this vision to the public effectively.
- Encourage buy-in of policy makers so they can pave the way to implement the big picture vision.
- When making the case, start with the “why”, not “how”; people may process this better.
- If cultural norms are to shift, pilot projects must be done to a top quality standard.
- Attempt to get auto-centric community to accept lower speeds.
- Change will continue. Ensure we have the maximum flexibility to be able to adapt to future options.

Land Use

- Understand and communicate the role of the intersectionality of land use and transportation on healthy living.
- Support and promote increased density in development.
- Require transportation assessments for development projects.
- Curb urban sprawl.

Transit

- Fully account and communicate the cost of car dependency.
- Help make it easy to choose public transportation.
- Implement bus rapid transit in the urban core and along major corridors.
- Break down the silos. Proper transit planning can solve more problems than just congestion.

Public Health & Safety

- Transportation is a key detriment to public health.
- Highlight difficult pedestrian and bike crossings that intersect major routes; suggest best practices to resolve these issues.
- Safety is critical for all modes of transportation.

National Household Travel Survey

The Des Moines Area MPO participated as an add-on participant for the 2017 National Household Travel Survey. Being an add-on participant allowed the Des Moines Area to receive an increased sample size (1,225) and the ability to add MPO specific questions to the survey for the Des Moines region. Below are the add-on questions that were asked the survey respondents answers.

FIGURE H1: WHAT ARE THE TOP THREE REASONS YOU CHOSE YOUR CURRENT HOME LOCATION?

	NUMBER OF HOUSEHOLDS	PERCENT OF RESPONDENTS
Cost/price of home	636	49.2%
Home size and characteristics	575	44.5%
Public transportation	526	40.7%
Sidewalks	399	30.9%
Parking	176	13.6%
Convenient to work	420	32.5%
Convenient to school	110	8.5%
Convenient to retail (shopping, entertainment, restaurants)	261	20.2%
Close to friends and family	308	23.8%
Close to public transportation	37	2.9%
Close to scenic locations (beach, lake, golf course)	56	4.3%
Does not know answer	0	0.0%
No other choices apply	282	21.8%
Refused to answer	0	0.0%

FIGURE H2: WHAT TYPE OF TRANSPORTATION INVESTMENTS SHOULD THE DES MOINES REGION FOCUS ON? PLEASE SELECT YOUR TOP THREE CHOICES.

	NUMBER OF HOUSEHOLDS	PERCENT OF RESPONDENTS
New roadways	328	25.4%
Existing roadway maintenance/reconstruction	1,004	77.6%
Public transportation	526	40.7%
Sidewalks	399	30.9%
Parking	176	13.6%
High-occupancy vehicle lanes	0	0.0%
Bike lanes and paths	0	0.0%
Bike lanes	304	23.5%
Recreational trails	389	30.1%
Signal Coordination	0	0.0%
Does not know answer	3	0.2%
No other reasons	454	35.1%

FIGURE H3: WHAT ARE THE THREE MOST IMPORTANT FACTORS THAT WOULD MAKE DART'S SYSTEM A GOOD OPTION FOR (YOUR) COMMUTE?

	NUMBER OF PERSONS	PERCENT OF RESPONDENTS
Close to work and home	657	23.6%
Fits schedule	761	27.4%
Faster than driving	399	14.4%
Reasonable in cost	521	18.7%
Consistently on time	451	16.2%
Avoids travel stress	258	9.3%
Safety	145	5.2%
Does not know answer	1	0.0%
No other reasons	456	16.4%

FIGURE H4: WHICH OF THE FOLLOWING REASONS WOULD INFLUENCE YOUR DECISION TO ALLOW YOUR CHILD/ CHILDREN TO WALK/BIKE TO SCHOOL?

	NUMBER OF HOUSEHOLDS	PERCENT OF RESPONDENTS
Crossing guards present	119	9.2%
Presence of adult chaper-ones/supervision	114	8.8%
Sidewalk and crosswalks are located along the route	193	14.9%
School participates in a Safe Routes to Schools program	59	4.6%
Education and training is provided for children, parents, and others	13	1.0%
School is located within neighborhood	138	10.7%
Distance between home and school	231	17.9%
Don't know	2	0.2%
Refused to answer	3	0.2%

Capacity Project Submittal

MPO staff also sought feedback on projects that had been submitted by member governments for consideration in the plan. To gather this feedback, MPO staff hosted an interactive map on its website that illustrated all capacity projects submitted for consideration along with basic information about each project. Participants could review the projects and then submit comments via an online form.

FIGURE H5: ONLINE COMMENTS RECEIVED ABOUT PROJECTS SUBMITTED

PROJECT #	COMMENT	SUPPORT
101	Residents on S side of Altoona need alternate routes... so much winding and sneaking through or around neighborhoods to get anywhere	Yes
202		Yes
202		Yes
206		Yes
206		Yes
206		Yes
208		Yes
208	This project is needed for the safe flow of traffic in the growing northern section of Ankeny.	Yes
210		Yes
212		Yes
212		Yes
214		Yes
216		Yes
217		Yes
217	Needs to happen much sooner than currently planned.	Yes
217	This project is desperately needed for the safe flow of traffic in the growing northwest sector of Ankeny.	Yes
223		Yes
223	This project is desperately needed to ensure the safe flow of traffic in the growing northwest corner of Ankeny.	Yes
223		Yes

FIGURE H5 ONLINE COMMENTS RECEIVED ABOUT PROJECTS SUBMITTED (CONTINUED)

PROJECT #	COMMENT	SUPPORT
224		Yes
224		Yes
601		Yes
601		Yes
601		No
601	Can't wait for its completion!	Yes
601		Yes
602	According to your map this is not a congested street now and won't be in 2050. So to widen it fixes no problem and makes pedestrian crossing of the street more difficult and wastes money.	No
603	According to your map this is not a congested street now and won't be in 2050. So to widen it fixes no problem and makes pedestrian crossing of the street more difficult and wastes money.	No
603	It's irresponsible to add lanes when we can barely afford to maintain the roads we have.	No
604	Widening doesn't improve travel times long term, but increases taxpayer cost.	No
604	Widening doesn't improve travel times long term, but increases taxpayer cost. Go to 3 lanes and start supporting bike travel and improved public transportation along this corridor.	No
4021	Ooh, the people who sell parking in their front yards during the fair are gonna hate you if you take so much as a square inch of their yard! I am a fan of continuous center turn lanes, but I'm concerned about pedestrian traffic, especially during the fair. Also seems like a place where there could be a lot of bus & bike traffic if it was done well... biking to the fair would be awesome!	Unsure
605	According to your map this is not a congested street now and won't be in 2050. So to widen it fixes no problem and makes pedestrian crossing of the street more difficult and wastes money.	No
606	Project must include ped facilities	Yes
606	This project is not necessary. It would be better to make improvements to existing streets to connect to the SW	No
606		No
606	I like having the bike trail back there and not having to worry about automobile traffic and associated noise. And don't some of those businesses use the tracks? If not, maybe that would still be a good place for mass transit and not another car road. I think having a road on that side of the buildings would totally destroy the ambiance of Confluence's back patio, and I don't want my favorite brewery ruined.	No
606	Gray's Lake Park would be disrupted by adding a road here.	No
606	Project must include ped and bike facilities	Yes

FIGURE H5: ONLINE COMMENTS RECEIVED ABOUT PROJECTS SUBMITTED (CONTINUED)

PROJECT #	COMMENT	SUPPORT
606	This project is not necessary. It would be better to make improvements to existing streets to connect to the SW	No
606		No
606	I like having the bike trail back there and not having to worry about automobile traffic and associated noise. And don't some of those businesses use the tracks? If not, maybe that would still be a good place for mass transit and not another car road. I think having a road on that side of the buildings would totally destroy the ambiance of Confluence's back patio, and I don't want my favorite brewery ruined.	No
606	Gray's Lake Park would be disrupted by adding a road here.	No
606	Project must include ped and bike facilities	Yes
606		No
606	Stop building roads until we properly fund our public transit.	No
607	According to your map this is not a congested street now and won't be in 2050. So to widen it fixes no problem and makes pedestrian crossing of the street more difficult and wastes money.	No
608		No
608	Widening doesn't improve travel times long term, but increases taxpayer cost.	No
608		No
608	According to your map this is not a congested street now and won't be in 2050. So to widen it fixes no problem and makes pedestrian crossing of the street more difficult and wastes money.	No
608	According to your map this is not a congested street now and won't be in 2050. So to widen it fixes no problem and makes pedestrian crossing of the street more difficult and wastes money.	No
801		Yes
802		Yes
1302		Yes
1402		Yes
1406	There is no good bicycle route from this part of southern Waukee to the Waukee trailhead. Will this project include bike lanes or a separate 10 foot path?	Unsure
1407	There is no good bicycle route from this part of southern Waukee to the Waukee trailhead. Will this project include bike lanes or a separate 10 foot path?	Unsure

FIGURE H5: ONLINE COMMENTS RECEIVED ABOUT PROJECTS SUBMITTED (CONTINUED)

PROJECT #	COMMENT	SUPPORT
1411	This should be a road diet. Continuous center turn lane + bike lanes. The size of intersections in the suburbs is horrifying as a pedestrian and cyclist. Widening this to 4 lanes will just make it worse. Plus, then people who live in the burbs will be able to practice navigating this style of road on their own neighbors so they won't kill one of mine when they come to a real city! (I mean, as close as you can get in Iowa.) But seriously, whoever is doing Kansas-style roads in Clive/Waukee/Urbandale is just The Worst. I hate driving them and navigating as a bike or pedestrian seems impossible. I would rather drive literally anywhere in Des Moines proper. The suburbs' only redeeming feature would be the roundabouts... if people would actually freaking signal!	No
1420		Yes
1420		Yes
1501	This will improve access to this area	Yes
1502		Yes
1513	This should be 5 lanes max. People should be able to cross the street safely.	No
1513	This should be 5 lanes max. People should be able to cross the street safely.	No
1514	This will improve access to this area	Yes
1518	This project is ridiculous. There is absolutely no need for a 6-lane roadway to go through this area. It is literally just a few hundred feet south of why 5. There is already Adams road that goes to the same spot. What a waste of taxpayer dollars and a waste of great farmland. None of the local residents were in favor of this project, but it got railroaded through after years and years of not being able to move it forward-- because it wasn't (and still isn't) needed. This project need to be stopped and kept at no more than 2 lanes. Study after study shows how bad this kind of roadway is. It is not needed to reduce congestion-- there is not congestion on Hwy 5 and I-80 is not bad either. In fact, it is likely to create more congestion. Please do not give another dime to this horrible project.	No
1521		Yes
1521		Yes
1521	So... it's going to be impossible to make a left turn out of the hyvee parking lot to go south? Also there should be pedestrian and bike traffic considerations around grocery stores. Obviously no one is walking to the golf course, but the east side should have good pedestrian infrastructure.	Unsure
1522		Yes
2101	This corridor has no sidewalks. We should be addressing basic neighborhood needs before we contemplate adding lanes for commuters.	Unsure
2101		Yes

FIGURE H5: ONLINE COMMENTS RECEIVED ABOUT PROJECTS SUBMITTED (CONTINUED)

PROJECT #	COMMENT	SUPPORT
2101	Thank you for providing a safe bikeway east-west in this area.	Yes
2101		No
2101	According to your map this is not a congested street now and won't be in 2050. So to widen it fixes no problem and makes pedestrian crossing of the street more difficult and wastes money.	No
2102		Yes
2102	Thoughtful safety improvements. Thank you	Yes
2102	Love the center turn lane and consideration of vehicles other than automobiles.	Yes
2103		Yes
2103		No
2103	What is the purpose? This would be taking private property, some wooded area to make a road that isn't needed. The cost alone seems wasteful. Actually fix the roads so they are smooth, consider a stoplight but a new road is going to destroy our neighborhood plus increase speed on the road. Most people live in this area for the small town feel, lets keep it that way.	No
2103	Progress is good for the community!	Yes
2103	Waste of money. I don't the amount of traffic warrants it. Especially since it would displace businesses.	No
2103	Waste of money. I don't the amount of traffic warrants it. Especially since it would displace businesses.	No
2103		Yes
2103	How will this affect the existing homes and businesses on 65 Ln	Unsure
2103		Yes
2103		Yes
2103	I live in the area. Traffic is too fast on NW 6th Drive.	Unsure
2103		No
2103		Unsure
4001	Finally! However should have kept three lanes all the way to first street during construction as it has caused a headache for afternoon rush hour	Yes

FIGURE H5: ONLINE COMMENTS RECEIVED ABOUT PROJECTS SUBMITTED (CONTINUED)

PROJECT #	COMMENT	SUPPORT
4002	Fixing intersections without having to widen a road I'm all for! Seems too expensive though, this project should be pretty simple	Yes
4003		No
4003		No
4003	Widening doesn't improve travel times long term, but increases taxpayer cost.	No
4003		Yes
4003		No
4003		Yes
4003		Yes
4003	<p>Goal 1 of Mobilizing Tomorrow is "Enhance multimodal transportation options." Goal 2 is "Manage and optimize transportation infrastructure and services." Goal 3 is "Improve the region's environmental health", and Goal 4 is "Further the health, safety, and well-being of all residents in the region." Nowhere in the goals does it say "add lanes and road capacity". Even with the most generous interpretation of Goal 2, "optimize" should not be interpreted to mean road widening. It would be irresponsible of the MPO Board to put all 40 percent of federal funds towards road widening. It's fiscally irresponsible because it saddles taxpayers with added maintenance costs. It's environmentally responsible when our planet is burning up. And building a transportation system that all but forces people to drive does absolutely nothing to further the health, safety, and well-being of our residents. No city ever built its way out of a traffic problem by adding lanes. We can learn from mistakes made in other cities, but we have to start now. I urge the MPO Board to reject all these road widening projects, and work to improve our transit system to the Greater Des Moines Metro can truly thrive.</p>	No
4007		No
4007	This stretch of I80 is a nightmare. Add an exit in Altoona as well	Yes
4007	<p>Goal 1 of Mobilizing Tomorrow is "Enhance multimodal transportation options." Goal 2 is "Manage and optimize transportation infrastructure and services." Goal 3 is "Improve the region's environmental health", and Goal 4 is "Further the health, safety, and well-being of all residents in the region." Nowhere in the goals does it say "add lanes and road capacity". Even with the most generous interpretation of Goal 2, "optimize" should not be interpreted to mean road widening. It would be irresponsible of the MPO Board to put all 40 percent of federal funds towards road widening. It's fiscally irresponsible because it saddles taxpayers with added maintenance costs. It's environmentally responsible when our planet is burning up. And building a transportation system that all but forces people to drive does absolutely nothing to further the health, safety, and well-being of our residents. No city ever built its way out of a traffic problem by adding lanes. We can learn from mistakes made in other cities, but we have to start now. I urge the MPO Board to reject all these road widening projects, and work to improve our transit system to the Greater Des Moines Metro can truly thrive.</p>	No
4009		No

FIGURE H5: ONLINE COMMENTS RECEIVED ABOUT PROJECTS SUBMITTED (CONTINUED)

PROJECT #	COMMENT	SUPPORT
4009	This would be a waste if stoplights continue to be added to 141. Stupid to spend 20 MILLION dollars to make a quicker exit ramp only to sit at twelve stoplights for tiny side streets.	No
4009		Yes
4010		No
4010		Yes
4010	Goal 1 of Mobilizing Tomorrow is "Enhance multimodal transportation options." Goal 2 is "Manage and optimize transportation infrastructure and services." Goal 3 is "Improve the region's environmental health", and Goal 4 is "Further the health, safety, and well-being of all residents in the region." Nowhere in the goals does it say "add lanes and road capacity". Even with the most generous interpretation of Goal 2, "optimize" should not be interpreted to mean road widening. It would be irresponsible of the MPO Board to put all 40 percent of federal funds towards road widening. It's fiscally irresponsible because it saddles taxpayers with added maintenance costs. It's environmentally responsible when our planet is burning up. And building a transportation system that all but forces people to drive does absolutely nothing to further the health, safety, and well-being of our residents. No city ever built its way out of a traffic problem by adding lanes. We can learn from mistakes made in other cities, but we have to start now. I urge the MPO Board to reject all these road widening projects, and work to improve our transit system to the Greater Des Moines Metro can truly thrive.	No
4010		Yes
4011		Yes
4011	Goal 1 of Mobilizing Tomorrow is "Enhance multimodal transportation options." Goal 2 is "Manage and optimize transportation infrastructure and services." Goal 3 is "Improve the region's environmental health", and Goal 4 is "Further the health, safety, and well-being of all residents in the region." Nowhere in the goals does it say "add lanes and road capacity". Even with the most generous interpretation of Goal 2, "optimize" should not be interpreted to mean road widening. It would be irresponsible of the MPO Board to put all 40 percent of federal funds towards road widening. It's fiscally irresponsible because it saddles taxpayers with added maintenance costs. It's environmentally responsible when our planet is burning up. And building a transportation system that all but forces people to drive does absolutely nothing to further the health, safety, and well-being of our residents. No city ever built its way out of a traffic problem by adding lanes. We can learn from mistakes made in other cities, but we have to start now. I urge the MPO Board to reject all these road widening projects, and work to improve our transit system to the Greater Des Moines Metro can truly thrive.	No
4011		Yes
4012		Yes

FIGURE H5: ONLINE COMMENTS RECEIVED ABOUT PROJECTS SUBMITTED (CONTINUED)

PROJECT #	COMMENT	SUPPORT
4012	Goal 1 of Mobilizing Tomorrow is "Enhance multimodal transportation options." Goal 2 is "Manage and optimize transportation infrastructure and services." Goal 3 is "Improve the region's environmental health", and Goal 4 is "Further the health, safety, and well-being of all residents in the region." Nowhere in the goals does it say "add lanes and road capacity". Even with the most generous interpretation of Goal 2, "optimize" should not be interpreted to mean road widening. It would be irresponsible of the MPO Board to put all 40 percent of federal funds towards road widening. It's fiscally irresponsible because it saddles taxpayers with added maintenance costs. It's environmentally responsible when our planet is burning up. And building a transportation system that all but forces people to drive does absolutely nothing to further the health, safety, and well-being of our residents. No city ever built its way out of a traffic problem by adding lanes. We can learn from mistakes made in other cities, but we have to start now. I urge the MPO Board to reject all these road widening projects, and work to improve our transit system to the Greater Des Moines Metro can truly thrive.	No
4014		No
4014	Widening doesn't improve travel times long term, but increases taxpayer cost. Go to 3 lanes and support biking and improved public transportation along this corridor.	No
4014		No
4014	According to your map this is not a congested street now and won't be in 2050. So to widen it fixes no problem and makes pedestrian crossing of the street more difficult and wastes money.	No
4014	I think this goes through some historic neighborhoods; it's important to me that historic properties are not negatively impacted or demolished. There is also a lot of pedestrian traffic in the area, so I'm concerned that widening the road will make it less safe for non-auto traffic. Maybe this would be another good place for a road diet- center turn lane and bike lanes... or even something that is optimized for busses, since a lot of people going to the VA are old/can't drive.	Unsure
4014	I think this goes through some historic neighborhoods; it's important to me that historic properties are not negatively impacted or demolished. There is also a lot of pedestrian traffic in the area, so I'm concerned that widening the road will make it less safe for non-auto traffic. Maybe this would be another good place for a road diet- center turn lane and bike lanes... or even something that is optimized for busses, since a lot of people going to the VA are old/can't drive.	Unsure
4015	According to your map this is not a congested street now and won't be in 2050. So to widen it fixes no problem and makes pedestrian crossing of the street more difficult and wastes money.	No
4016	More lanes is not the answer, unless some are for bikes. More lanes won't make the road safer, especially for students of East, Hiatt, Grand View, etc.	No
4016	Widening doesn't improve travel times long term, but increases municipal cost.	No
4016		No
4016	According to your map this is not a congested street now and won't be in 2050. So to widen it fixes no problem and makes pedestrian crossing of the street more difficult and wastes money.	No
4016	Traffic counts look to be 12,000-17,000. Three lanes can carry this. Don't encourage induced demand.	No

FIGURE H5: ONLINE COMMENTS RECEIVED ABOUT PROJECTS SUBMITTED (CONTINUED)

PROJECT #	COMMENT	SUPPORT
4016	I'm concerned about the effect on historic properties, and a road this wide seems inappropriate in such a residential area of town. The east side needs more bike lanes, so I'd rather see a road diet type of situation... but a continuous center turn lane is probably a good idea. I'm just concerned about pedestrians and bikes being able to cross safely. The road is bad right now, so almost anything would be an improvement, but multi-modal traffic should be a consideration, especially since there is also lots of school traffic.	No
4016	It is completely irresponsible to widen this road. There are families that live along this street, not to mention East High. Widening the street will increase crossing distances for pedestrians. It will lead to more motor vehicles driving at higher speeds, and more car-pedestrian fatalities.	No
4017		No
4017	Isn't this stretch already one-way? Having one-way streets creates speeding. E.14th should be converted to two-way to keep some of the traffic off of E. 15- which borders schools and residential and is highly pedestrian.	No
4017		No
4017	My office is located on this stretch of E 14th. I walk along this road. My daughters attend daycare at Uncle Sam's. Get the DOT and their interstate-building ideas out of Des Moines! More cars and more fatalities will be the only result if this project is approved.	No
4018	Adding more lanes will not make this road safer	No
4018		No
4018	My office is located along E 14th. I see cars back up going south bound in the afternoons. If someone thinks this tiny amount of congestion requires expanding the road, they probably work in the construction industry. Or for the DOT.	No
4019	This is needed from a safety standpoint	Yes
4019		Yes
4019		Yes
4019		Yes
4021	According to your map this is not a congested street now and won't be in 2050. So to widen it fixes no problem and makes pedestrian crossing of the street more difficult and wastes money.	No
4022		No
4023		No
4023	This project will result in additional motor vehicle traffic. It will not "reduce congestion". It will induce more people to drive. There is a daycare located right along this road! Have some human decency.	No

FIGURE H5: ONLINE COMMENTS RECEIVED ABOUT PROJECTS SUBMITTED (CONTINUED)

PROJECT #	COMMENT	SUPPORT
4024	The Hwy 65 bypass was built for a reason. Stop trying to turn E 14th into another interstate.	No
4025	I-35 does not need widening in this area. This is only being done to encourage more urban sprawl- the LAST thing we need. Please do not continue with this. Instead money should be spent on improving and expanding public transit, expanding multi-modal transportation, increasing walkability and bikeability. We do not need any more expanded and enlarged highways or interstates.	No
4026		No
4027		Yes
4028	More lanes = more traffic. This is a band-aid, will inhibit more sprawl, and will hurt those who live near the Interstate. Funds are better spent on better land use policy and transit alternatives.	No
4028		No
4028	Widening doesn't improve travel times long term, but increases taxpayer cost.	No
4028		No
4028	This project needs to be a priority.	Yes
4028	Use ramp metering instead. Widening will just induce demand.	No
4028		No
4028	Widening will only encourage more sprawl. Need to run mass transit from downtown to Waukee down the train track that already exists. This would fix traffic issue with no widening!	No
4028	Widening will only encourage more sprawl. Need to run mass transit from downtown to Waukee down the train track that already exists. This would fix traffic issue with no widening!	No
4028	I drive eastbound on this road during evening rush hour and the real problem is the entrances from Valley West and 73rd... people don't realize they need to accelerate and immediately merge and that is what causes bottlenecks. Widening the road won't help unless that problem is fixed. Some people drive cars that can't accelerate that fast, but most people just aren't paying attention. There needs to be a big, obvious sign. Possibly 3.	Unsure
4028	I drive eastbound on this road during evening rush hour and the real problem is the entrances from Valley West and 73rd... people don't realize they need to accelerate and immediately merge and that is what causes bottlenecks. Widening the road won't help unless that problem is fixed. Some people drive cars that can't accelerate that fast, but most people just aren't paying attention. There needs to be a big, obvious sign. Possibly 3.	Unsure

FIGURE H5: ONLINE COMMENTS RECEIVED ABOUT PROJECTS SUBMITTED (CONTINUED)

PROJECT #	COMMENT	SUPPORT
4028	<p>Goal 1 of Mobilizing Tomorrow is "Enhance multimodal transportation options." Goal 2 is "Manage and optimize transportation infrastructure and services." Goal 3 is "Improve the region's environmental health", and Goal 4 is "Further the health, safety, and well-being of all residents in the region." Nowhere in the goals does it say "add lanes and road capacity". Even with the most generous interpretation of Goal 2, "optimize" should not be interpreted to mean road widening. It would be irresponsible of the MPO Board to put all 40 percent of federal funds towards road widening. It's fiscally irresponsible because it saddles taxpayers with added maintenance costs. It's environmentally responsible when our planet is burning up. And building a transportation system that all but forces people to drive does absolutely nothing to further the health, safety, and well-being of our residents. No city ever built its way out of a traffic problem by adding lanes. We can learn from mistakes made in other cities, but we have to start now. I urge the MPO Board to reject all these road widening projects, and work to improve our transit system to the Greater Des Moines Metro can truly thrive.</p>	No
4028	<p>I drive this road almost every weekday and it has become noticeably more congested in the last five years. I remember the idea when i-235 was being reconstructed was to build the entire interstate to have four lanes. Building the interstate to have four lanes all the way through will greatly help traffic flow.</p>	Yes

Draft Plan Document

The long-range transportation plan requires a 45-day public comment period which opened on September 24, 2019. Staff collected public comment through November 10, 2019. The individual sections of the plan were posted on the MPO website and the public had the opportunity to submit comments online. The MPO also hosted an Open House on October 22, 2019, to provide an additional opportunity for the public to comment on the draft plan. **Figure G6** provides a summary of all the comments that were submitted on the draft plan.

FIGURE H6: COMMENTS RECEIVED ON DRAFT PLAN

LRTP SECTION	COMMENT
Chapter 1	The first sentence tripped me up while reading. Consider wording.
Chapter 1	First sentence: "...is a task that never ends" or "...is a task that is never finished." Using the words "is a task that is never done" implies that no one ever prepares for the future of transportation systems. I misread that off the bat, and it threw me off. (sorry for being picky)
Chapter 1	Regarding public transit/bus access to individuals on outer areas of DART map and access to individuals with physical disabilities: As an Administrator for a local disability services provider serving 120 individuals in the greater Des Moines metropolitan area, it has proven increasingly difficult to provide training and access for individuals needing transportation solutions to use the DART bus system. Often, the times when individuals need transportation are outside of the hours of operations (i.e. weekends/holidays) when people still need to get to work and rely on these systems. Continued growth and development of housing in far south Des Moines, Grimes, northern Johnston, Altoona, Pleasant Hill, Wake, etc., especially options for low-income housing has not been met comparable growth and expansion of access to public transportation services. Individuals with disabilities have limited options in their housing choices, primarily due to physical barriers to housing, and often are not able to reside in their desired communities due to needing to access public transportation, yet options available to them are vastly expensive or unavailable. Would like to see expanded service areas, more flexible on-call service, and weekend/holiday schedules for the public transit system to improve the community's access to public transportation.
Chapter 1	First page, second paragraph: "And it does so in THE face of considerable change." (OK, I'll try reading this at a later time and sticking only to content-based comments. My brain seems stuck on policing grammar.)
Chapter 2	Page 23- There is no way Hwy 415 is in "fair" condition between it's southern terminus and I80/35. The pavement is falling apart especially in the outer lanes.
Chapter 2	I'm most interested in the goals around reducing car dependence, increasing transit modeshare, and increasing pedestrian safety. I find these goals far too modest, and nowhere near the scale necessary to reduce our region's carbon emissions. Furthermore, I have no idea how the MPO plans to meet even these modest goals with the current level of funding for transit and pedestrian projects, and with its history of supporting projects that overbuild our road network.
Chapter 2	I forgot to add earlier that you list one bike lane, on NE 56th, as existing, when it does not, in fact, exist. There are several more that aren't actually bike lanes, but just sharrows or a bike painted onto the shoulder of very unsafe road. We should be starting with accurate data and working to build out a safe, high-quality on-street bike network from there.
Chapter 2	Appreciate the emphasis on maintaining current infrastructure versus expansion of infrastructure that promotes more travel by personal vehicle. The targets for goal 2 are hardly bold as the plan claims. The 2050 goals for on-street facilities and protected bike lanes should be 5-year goals. 25 miles of protected bike lanes in the next 30 years is hardly bold. Having 75% of trips still taking place by vehicle in 2050 is not bold. There are many examples of communities across the globe that in a 30-year period of have reduced vehicle travel to less than 25-30% in less than a 30-year period. We cannot address climate change, public health, affordability, environmental protection (land use, flooding, air quality, etc) unless we significantly reduce vehicle miles traveled. Strategies must be implemented that make vehicle travel slower and less direct and parking more expensive combined with an extensive increase in public transit, biking and walking alternatives. The money being spent on roadway expansion projects and new interchanges could go a long ways in expanding public transit development and access. What happened to all of the planning for bus rapid transit? What about the light rail studies conducted prior to I-235 reconstruction? What about the downtown tram study? What about the citizen support expressed in The Tomorrow Plan for greater emphasis on public transit options? We need to change the vision and the priorities. If the plan wants to help address health and food access issues, the plan should support protection of farmland, development of urban farming options (vacant lots, transformation of surface parking lots).

FIGURE H6: COMMENTS RECEIVED ON DRAFT PLAN (CONTINUED)

LRTP SECTION	COMMENT
Chapter 2	Focus on mass transit and pedestrian friendly infrastructure, not road widening
Chapter 2	page 38- figure could use years on the horizontal axis
Chapter 2	page 56- downtown should definitely be induced as having access. Hyvee, and other smaller stores for food are all within walking distance.
Chapter 3	Too much money being spent on new roads
Chapter 3	It is absolutely unacceptable that the funds allocated toward roadway expansion for SOVs is eleven times the funding allocated to bike, pedestrian, and transit infrastructure COMBINED. This is guaranteed to undermine our milquetoast bike, pedestrian, transit, and environmental goals.
Chapter 3	The investment strategy proposed puts too much priority on vehicle travel. The region will never move away from being car centric unless we invest differently. A much higher percentage of the investment needs to be in alternatives to personal vehicle travel such as public transit, biking, walking and telecommuting. The many proposed road widening and interchange projects will not promote alternatives to traveling in personal vehicles. The investment strategy does not constitute a strong commitment to getting people out of cars. How are all of the proposed widening projects and interchanges going to be maintained long-term?
Chapter 3	We need to improve the southbound HWY 65 ramp onto HWY 163 in Pleasant Hill. During the week, (morning, noon time and evening) rush hours we have vehicles backed up the leading edge and sometimes onto the southbound slow lane of HWY 65. Cars pass each other on the south bound ramp using the ramp shoulders. The volume of slow starting semi truck traffic contributes to the problem. I have sat on the ramp for up to 4 traffic signal changes before being able to make a left (eastbound) turn. I am always concerned about being rammed by a vehicle who does not know about the stopped traffic as they crest the leading edge of the ramp. These are dangerous practices and require immediate study, design and reconstruction, even as a temporary fix. We need to create a three lane ramp with dedicated left and right turn lanes, with the center lane allowed to go either direction, to allow the ramp to clear quicker. I understand the installation of a new traffic control system along HWY 163 is in progress, but doubt it will resolve all of the issues. I cannot believe that between now (2019 and 2050) that IDOT or Pleasant Hill City Staff has not proposed a project to resolve this issue.
Chapter 3	Why isn't there money for the hyperloop?
Chapter 4	This chapter and the document as a whole underprioritizes public transit. Public transit use in Des Moines is lower above all due to underinvestment in public transit. I am a regular DART rider for my work commute. We are a one car family of 5, and my spouse and I sometimes take our kids to events downtown by DART. DART is better than owning a second car economically and in terms of quality of life (if I wanted a suburban life I'd move the suburbs). That said DART is less convenient and enjoyable than public transit in Minneapolis and Chicago, where I previously lived for several years. With more buses, routes that connected more parts of the city, and ideally light rails as well, and free day-long transfers, more people could ride DART. There are also environmental benefits in terms of both climate change and air pollution. The policy ought to be to dramatically expand and to cheap rider access to DART and to provide disincentives for car use (maybe tax suburban drivers who commute to Des Moines for work, via a city sticker or toll system?). I will add that this comment process is hard to find and the way the documents are organized makes it hard to comment on; given the ramifications for residents this should be done better.
Appendix I	Low income and Section 8 approved housing is difficult to obtain. Meadowlands court and Meadowlands Drive in Des Moines offer housing opportunities but you have to walk across the highway to get to Southridge mall for a bus stop. It is very dangerous as there are no sidewalks and you have to walk along the side of the highway. A bus stop or sidewalks and safe crosswalks are really needed in this area. I had to move here because I could not get housing in a place with accessible bus stops and several neighbors experience the same challenges.

FIGURE H6: COMMENTS RECEIVED ON DRAFT PLAN (CONTINUED)

LRTP SECTION	COMMENT
<p>General</p>	<p>Survey major areas of low income employment in Des Moines very carefully. This would include hospitals, nursing homes, motels, restaurants, other service workers including store clerks, recreation services, summer employment. For instance, around University and the interstate on the west side there is an intense concentration of motels and restaurants. Next, with equal intensity, survey areas where costs of housing are within the lower quartile. The median cost is too high for most low income employees and their families. Finally, map the low cost (public transit, walking, cycling, and low cost parking) transit options connecting these areas. T4A said Safety for walking and cycling, recreation, as well as transit, was one of the primary goals. Second was Maintenance, and the third was Connectivity. These could only be evaluated through the information listed above. Finally a careful survey of connectivity to basic services, health, education and nutrition services with identification of food deserts, needs to be available to planners. Along with this we need to have careful studies and projections of changes likely to occur over the next 20 years. Will a new black, latinex, or asian communities and services develop or will there be greater integration at lower income levels, within the community. Homeless services need to be addressed to avoid the current cycle of development and destruction of camps. More permanent services need to be planned and developed for single people and families in low or no income levels that would include, again, access and connectivity with health, education and social services. Currently, children in families in the poverty cycle move from school to school as the family moves, with detrimental effects on growth and education. I have a strong belief that planners have little experience in dealing with these problems, and tend to look at their work from a middle or upper middle class point of view- an example of this is the "missing middle" and ADU emphasis rather than the homeless or poverty problems which are seen as someone else's problem. Enough for a few year's work. Thank you for your concern and desire for input.</p>
<p>General</p>	<p>Our long range vision should place ahead of roadway expansion nearly every other transit option. Ensuring projects are multimodal is important in a long range vision and should be prioritized. Also anytime the MPO considers expanded capacity, such as a highway or freeway road widening, an equivalent look at public transit and metro passenger rail should be weighed in order to determine the best value. When placing public transit and rail behind other transportation investments we miss huge opportunities to benefit our metro residents and businesses. I hope the long range vision can be visionary and see beyond our current costly sprawl.</p> <p>More specifically, I'm supportive of finishing the SE connector so long as it continues to focus on incorporating walking and biking components.</p> <p>Finally, I'll add here in Pleasant Hill the interchange with highway 65 and highway 163 (E. University) is dangerous and needs to undergo some sort of redesign for public safety.</p>

